



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW

JULY, 1903

EA ; YAHVEH : DYAUS ; ZEYΣ ; JUPITER.

## I. GLASER'S THEORY.

Is it any longer possible to determine the original force and inter-relations of these Babylonian, Hebrew, and Aryan names of the or a deity? This secular question has recently been again raised by the Himyaritic scholar, Dr. Eduard Glaser<sup>1</sup>, who endeavours to show that all five terms are philologically one, the archetype and primary form being the Indian *Dyaus*, whence the others are directly or indirectly derived. It may at once be stated that the main contention breaks down completely, and that for the same reason that has made shipwreck of so many similar theories—neglect of some of the essential factors of the problem. With characteristic frankness Dr. Glaser admits that he is no “Kenner des Indischen,” while on the other hand he strangely overlooks the Italic field which will be seen to present an insuperable objection to the acceptance of his general views. These are nowhere formulated in very precise language; indeed are often expressed somewhat vaguely, and even with marked

<sup>1</sup> *Jehowah-Joris und die drei Söhne Noah's*, Munich, 1901.

symptoms of doubt and hesitation. But their general tenor may be deduced from a number of passages which will be found interspersed with other matter between pages 19 and 25 of the monograph, and may here be conveniently brought together.

Of the term יהה he considers that "die ältesten Formen sind יָ (dazu die verlängerte Form יֶהֱ) und יִ (dazu יִהֶ), denen sich als vollständigere Formen *Jaweh* (durch Hinzufügung der Silbe הָ zu יִ) und *Jehōweh* (יֶהֱ + הָ) anschliessen." Thus Glaser takes *Yah* to be the oldest form, without, however, explaining the process and *raison d'être* of the later developments, which have been so ingeniously set forth by Mr. J. H. Levy in a recent number of this *Review*. This conclusion I may here say that I all the more readily accept since it is both highly probable in itself, and also harmonizes completely with my own views regarding the *provenance* and true relations of *Fahveh* (*Yah*).

Glaser continues: "Diese Form [*Yah* or *Yô*, *Yau*, perhaps also *Yû*] hat gar nichts Grammatisches an sich, ja es kann nicht einmal, wenigstens nicht mit stichhaltigen Gründen, behauptet werden, dass sie semitischen Ursprungs ist. *Jah* ist jedenfalls älter als die israelitische Geschichte.... Andererseits erinnert der babylonische Gott *Ea*, der vielleicht *Ejah* oder *Ijah* lautete, an *Jah*." Here also I am in full accord, as it is part of my thesis that *Yah* is non-Semitic, and identical with the pre-Semitic Sumerian god *Ea* of Chaldaea.

Then: "Eines springt sofort deutlich in die Augen: die Aehnlichkeit des lateinischen *Jovis* und der ersten Silbe von *Jupiter* mit *Jhoweh* oder *Jōweh*, bzw. mit *J(a)hû*. Man erklärt bekanntlich den Componenten *piter* in *Jupiter* in der Regel als indisches *pitar*, latein. *pater*, 'Vater,' und erblickt im ersten Componenten *Ju* eine verwandte Bildung mit *Zeus*=indisch *Dyâus* (*Jovis* + *pater*, aus *Diovis* + *pater*, aus indisch *Dyâuspitar*, dazu *Dios*, Genitiv von *Zeus*). Da *Dyâus* sowol an *Zeus* wie auch an *Jovis* (*Djâuis*, *Jâuis*) genügend deutlich anklingt, so dürfte der Zusammenhang

des griechischen und des römischen Gottesnamens mit dem indischen Dyâus als feststehend anerkannt werden.... Wenn dem aber so ist, dann frage ich: warum soll das nur für Jovis und Jupiter gelten, warum nicht auch für יהוה, יהו und י? Ich finde dass z. B. יהי viel genauer noch als das lateinische Ju dem indischen (D)yâu(s) entspricht. Für mich steht also fest, dass auch der israelitische Gottesname lautlich genau in demselben Verhältnis zu dem indischen Dyâus steht wie der römische, aber etwas weniger genau als der griechische.... Dass auch der babylonische Gott *Ea* oder *Ia* lautlich mit (D)yâ(us) identisch ist, bedarf kaum einer besonderen 'Betonung.'... Ebenso fest steht dass der indische Himmels-gott Dyâus, der semitische יהי, der griechische Zeus und der römische Jovis oder Jupiter ursprünglich ein und derselbe Gott sind."

Here we part company, and I now propose to show that nearly the whole of this etymological superstructure stands on a baseless foundation; that the Indian, Greek, and Latin terms have nothing in common beyond a common proto-Aryan source, from which all three spring independently one of the other; and that the Hebrew term does not, and could not, derive from any of them, but comes directly from the Babylonian which stands first in the group of names heading this article.

## II. DYAUS.

The last three members of the group are by comparative philologists almost unanimously referred to a root DIV, to shine, which in the Aryan mother-tongue had already developed several simple and compound derivative forms. In India these are represented by such terms as देव *deva*, a god, a demon; दैव *dairv*, divine; दिवस् *divas*, sky, day; *Déva-patir*, father of the gods; *divas-pati* and *dya-pati*, lord of heaven (Indra), and lord of day (the Sun).

Here it has to be noted that the initial voiced dental persists not only in these and all the other numerous

Sanskrit derivatives, but also in the numerous neo-Sanskritic tongues, as well as in the Iranic and Letto-Lithuanian branches of the Aryan linguistic family. Thus Hindi दिव् *div*, the sky; Zend *daéva*, and Pers. دیو *dev*, a demon; Lettic *Deevs*, God; Lithuanian *Dievs* and *Dievas*, God. But of an initial *d* there is no trace in *Yahveh* which consequently could not come from any of these sources directly. Glaser feels the difficulty, and is only able to suggest that "falls die genannten Nebenformen von Dyaus im indischen Schriftthum nicht nachweisbar sind [which is the case], dann müsste man irgend ein benachbartes Land als das Bindeglied zwischen der indischen Form einerseits und der hebräisch-römischen anderseits betrachten." But the only possible "Bindeglied" between India in the East, and Mesopotamia and Canaan in the West, is Irania, which is above excluded by the persistence of *d* both in ancient and modern Persian, and also amongst the Lithuanians, who, as I hold, came originally from the Iranian tableland. What then becomes of the assumption "dass auch der babylonische Gott *Ea* oder *Ia* lautlich mit (D)yâ(us) identisch ist, bedarf kaum einer besonderen Betonung"? The "connecting link" does not exist, and the whole argument falls to the ground.

Moreover, the Hindu Dyaus never assumed concrete shape as the name of the Deity, the *Ens Supremum*, as is admitted by Glaser himself, who quotes the remark of Lefmann, that "Dyâus und Prithivî gelangten auf indischem Boden zu keiner festen, bestimmten Gestalt," adding that "Dyâus anscheinend als concreter Gott überhaupt nicht aufkam." Dyaus was in no sense the head of a pantheon, like *Zeús* and Jupiter in Greece and Italy. He was rather analogous to the Egyptian *p-nutir*, τὸ θεῖον, the *divinum aliquid*, the first faint concept of a godlike unity or essence underlying the confused hierarchy of lesser deities, and suggestive at most of a tendency towards monotheism. The concept seems best expressed by Max Müller's *heno-*

*theism*<sup>1</sup>, a phase of belief in which each deity seems to stand somewhat apart, one a little more or a little less powerful than another, according to the realm of nature over which he presides, but without any fully recognized supreme headship. And the nearest approach to such a headship was, not Dyaus, but *Indra*, the ruler of the visible heavens, the “rex deorum,” the “Hindu Jove” as he has been called, whose dwelling was *Indra-puri*, “Indra’s city,” the Hindu Olympus, abode of the Immortals.

Hence the claim of Indra to rank as the absolute god-head has been allowed by some Sanskritists, and Eichhoff<sup>2</sup> amongst others remarks that “les écoles philosophiques de l’Inde résumaient l’idée monothéistique primitive par les noms de *Dévalévas*, le dieu des dieux, *Prajápatís*, le maître des créatures, et mieux encore par *Sán*, celui qui est.” This is true enough. But *quid inde?* Here the question turns on the primary concept, not on the mostly fanciful interpretations of the relatively recent “écoles philosophiques,” and although the notion of *Sán*, the self-existing, might seem to come nearest to that of *Yahveh*, as later understood, we shall see that such was not the original concept of the Hebrew *Yah*, any more than it was of Dyaus and Indra. Thus on all grounds—phonetic, theogonic, and even geographical—Dyaus, and with him all Hindu influences, is excluded absolutely, and the source of the intruding *Yahveh* must be sought elsewhere.

### III. ZETΣ AND JUPITER.

In Greece and Italy the organic initial Aryan dental has been, so to say, broken into fragments, doubtless by contact with the pre-Aryan, Pelasgic and Ligurian, inhabitants of those lands. While holding its ground in certain well-

<sup>1</sup> “If we must have a general name for the earliest form of religion among the Vedic Indians, it can be neither monotheism nor polytheism, but only *henotheism*” (*Hibbert Lectures*, 1878, p. 230).

<sup>2</sup> *Gram. générale indo-européenne*, p. 256.

defined connexions, the *d* has in others been diversely modified, here disappearing before an inherent vowel (*i*, *y*), there passing to a distinct palatal *y*, written *j*, and elsewhere further shifting to a voiced or sonant sibilant *z*, as in the Eng. *citizen*, where *z* stands for the palatal *y* of the Fr. *citoyen*. This assibilation of *d* before *i*, or a weak palatal, is widespread both in Hellas and Italy, where it had certainly been established in prehistoric times. Thus the Gr. ζυγόν, beside the Skr. *yugā* and the Lat. *iugum*, may very well represent a proto-Aryan *duḡum*, *dyuḡum*, from *duo* (two yoked together). So also Gr. ζα intensive stands for an original *da*, as in δάσκιος (σκιά), beside ζάθεος (θεός). Compare also the southern (Apulian) Oscan *zicolom* = diem, *ziculud* = die, as in *eisucen ziculud zicolom xxx* = "ex illo die in diem trigesimum" (*Tabula Bantina*, l. 17). Hence the inflected cases δῖός, διί, δῖα postulate an original *ḍís*, probably a contracted form of *dyéús*, which passes normally to Ζεús, voc. Ζεῦ, as in the Homeric Ζεῦ πάτερ. Thus this familiar compound runs on all fours both with the Skr. *Dévapátir*, as in *múrd'ni Dévapátir iva* (Bhâr. III), and with Lat. *Diespiter*, *Diespater*, *Diesptr*, as in an archaic inscription from a tomb at Praeneste (Palestrina):—

Micos aciles uictoria hereles  
diesptr iuno mircurios iacor, &c.<sup>1</sup>

These practically identical compound forms show, not that all are "aus indisch Dyâuspitar," as affirmed by Glaser (see above), but that such compounds had already been developed in ur-Aryan times, and were introduced independently by the first Aryan immigrants into India, Greece, and Italy. From the recent pre-Mykaenean (Pelasgian?) researches of A. J. Evans and others in the Aegean lands, it would now appear that the proto-Hellenes and the proto-Itali cannot have reached their Mediterranean seats from the Indo-European cradleland much before

<sup>1</sup> Lattes, *Le iscrizioni paleolatine*, &c., no. 122, now in the Vatican Museum.

2000 B.C. Even the Asiatic Aryans "invaded India by the north-west gate only some 4,000 years or less ago<sup>1</sup>." But we shall see that Yah had already about that date been introduced into the Hebrew theogony, and occurs in still older Cuneiform inscriptions deciphered by Delitzsch as the equal of the great Semitic god *ilu* (*El*) of Babylonia. Hence neither *Yah* nor *Yahveh*, nor any of the other variants, can be derived from any Graeco-Italic forms ( $\Delta\text{ΙΣ}$ ,  $\text{DIES}$ ) in which initial *d* still everywhere persisted. The *iuno* = Juno (from an earlier *Diuno*) following the *Diesptr* of the above-quoted Praeneste inscription shows that this is a relatively late document, not older in fact than or "about 250 B.C."<sup>2</sup> And we have the still later Horatian *Diespiter igni corusco nubila dividens* (*Od.* i. 34), and *Diespiter neglectus* (*Od.* iii. 2).

A cursory reference to Oscan, Umbrian, and the other Italic dialects akin to Latin, will make it abundantly evident that the initial dental still also held its ground nearly everywhere throughout the peninsula well into the historic period, that is, long after Yahveh had been enthroned in Palestine. I am desirous to lay the greater stress on this branch of the subject, since it has been so strangely neglected by Glaser.

In the Umbrian *Tabulae Iguvinae*, which cover the period from about 500 to 100 B.C., the dental has everywhere passed into the palatal, except of course in the forms corresponding to *deus* and the adjectival derivatives. Hence we have *Iuvepatre* (dat. case), *Iupater* (always voc. case), *Iuve Krapuri* = *Iovi Grabovio*, *Tcfri Iuvi*, *Tuse Iuvie*, &c., beside *dei Graboui*, *di Grabouie*, &c. But in Oscan, Sabine, and Samnite documents, as in Latin itself, the *d* persists down to quite late times. Thus, in the Samnite *Tabula Agnonensis*, now in the British Museum, *diuvei* = *iovi* occurs four times<sup>3</sup>. The oldest Capuan (North Oscan)

<sup>1</sup> T. H. Holland, *Anthrop. Jour.*, XXXII, 1902, p. 99.

<sup>2</sup> R. S. Conway, *The Italic Dialects*, Cambridge, 1897, vol. I, p. 310.

<sup>3</sup> Conway, *op. cit.*, I, p. 192.



heraldic dedications (about 300 B.C.) have *diuv-* normally for the later *iuv-*, as in *diuvilam tirentium*; *ek diuvil*; *diuvia*, &c. So also in the fragment from Bruttium:

*διουφει Φερσοφει ταυρομ,*

while even in the archaic Latin of Praeneste we have *fortuna diouo*, where *diouo*=*diouos*=*Iovis*, Gen. case, with loss of final *s*, but retention of initial *d*. We know also from a passage in Varro about the Sabine god Sancus that the Sabine dialect retained the dental to the last: 'Aelius Dium Fidium dicebat *Diovis* filium,' &c. (*de Lingua Lat.* 5. 66). In the same place he gives *diuom*=*caelum*, as if the etymological association of Jupiter with the sky were still remembered. That the association was still felt, even in the time of Servius, is clear from that writer's comment on *Aen.* ix. 570 "Sane lingua Osca Lucetius est Iupiter dictus a luce. . . Ipse est nostra lingua *Diespiter*, id est, *diei pater*." This was something more than a popular etymology, for after all *Diespiter* really was the personification of the bright sky, the day. The relation, however, of *dies* to *deus*, as of Skr. *dina* (Hind. दिन *din*) to *dyaus*, is not so clear, while the corresponding Greek form appears to have been early merged in \**Δις*, and then lost with it, at least in the nominative case.

It thus appears that in all the known Italic tongues the real form was some variant of *dies*, *deus*, and that the dental nearly everywhere survived till three or four centuries before the new era. Hence Glaser's assumption of "die Aehnlichkeit des lateinischen [bezw. italischen] *Jovis* und der ersten Silbe von *Jupiter* mit *Jhoweh* oder *Jôhweh*, bezw. mit J(a)hû," that is, with *Jahveh*, is highly unscientific, and at variance with the elementary laws of comparative philology. It is as if we should compare the modern *bishop*, *vescovo*, and *évêque* with each other without any reference to *ἐπίσκοπος* parent of all. Glaser would be the last person to do this, and I feel convinced that, had he not overlooked the Italic horizon, he would never have

committed the philological heresies which abound in his learned essay.

#### IV. EA.

Some reparation, however, is made by the admission that "die in den semitischen Ländern nachgewiesenen Formen *Ea*, יה, יהוה, יהו, יו &c., sich als unsemitische, somit als Lehnworte erweisen." As these terms are thus declared to be non-Semitic "loan-words," and as we have seen that they cannot have been imported from India, Irania, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, or any other Indo-European land, nothing remains except the Hamitic Egypt, which is not in question, and the pre-Semitic Akkado-Sumerian Babylonia, which is very much in evidence. In fact by this simple process of elimination alone a strong *prima facie* case is already made out for the Sumerian god *Ea*, as the true "begetter" of *Yah*. For it might be asked, if not from this source, whence? But the claims of *Ea* rest on much more solid grounds than this *a priori* argument, and we shall now see that they are supported by theogonic, phonetic, even historical and geographical considerations, which taken collectively may be regarded as conclusive.

It might at the outset be objected that *Ea* is excluded, because he was not even the head of the Babylonian Olympus, being overtopped by Bel (Bel-Merodach), whereas "Yahweh ist der mit eiserner Consequenz aus dem Götterkampf der damaligen Welt herausgeschmiedete Monotheismus" (Glaser). It is true that monotheism is mainly the outcome of a struggle between rival gods, but the struggle was a slow one, and the concept of pure monotheism, as distinguished from monolatry, was not realized till later (prophetic) times. W. Robertson Smith rightly speaks of "Semitic monolatry"<sup>1</sup> (worship of *one* God), and not of *Semitic monotheism* (belief in only one God).

<sup>1</sup> *Old Test. in Jewish Church*, Lect. X, p. 273. But he also speaks of "the heathenism of the great mass of the nation," Lect. V, p. 139; and further that the popular religion of Israel itself "was clearly modelled on the forms of Semitic heathenism" (ib., p. 285).

The popular notion that, not only the Israelites but all the Semites, were monotheists from the first, that monotheism was with them, so to say, a racial character, is a delusion which involves its advocates in endless contradictions. Thus Renan, after telling us that "the glory of the Semitic race is this, that from its earliest days it grasped that notion of the deity<sup>1</sup>," refers to the incident in the career of Mohammad, where he is reproached by the Koreish Sheikh, Otba, with causing disturbances and outraging *their common tribal gods*. Baring-Gould also writes that "the desert made the Arab *monotheistic*," and almost in the same breath that "Mahomet subverted the Ssabian *polytheism*<sup>2</sup>."

In point of fact this polytheism, characterized by the grossest anthropomorphism, and associated with the most revolting practices, prevailed throughout all the Semitic and Sumerian lands. "Before the time of Allah or of Yahveh every hill-top had its tutelar deity; the caves and rocks, and the very atmosphere swarmed with 'jins'; Assyrian and Phoenician pantheons, with their Baals and Molochs, and Astartes, and Adonais, were as thickly peopled as those of the Hellenes and Hindus, and in this, as in all other natural systems of belief, the monotheistic concept was gradually evolved by a slow process of elimination. Nor was the process perfected by all the Semitic peoples—Canaanites, Assyrians, Amorites, Phoenicians, and others, having always remained at the polytheistic stage—but only by the Hebrews and the Arabs, the two more richly endowed members of the Semitic family. Even here a reservation has to be made, for we now know that there was really but one evolution, that of Yahveh, the adoption of the idea embodied in Allah being historically traceable to the Jewish and Christian systems"<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> *Hist. gén. des langues sémit.*, I, 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Origin, &c., of Religious Belief*, pp. 105, 118.

<sup>3</sup> A. H. Keane, *Man Past and Present*, p. 502. Cf. also Delitzsch: "Trotz

But Yahveh himself, like all other supreme entities, had to undergo his normal evolution, which, as we shall see, was not perfected till prophetic times. At first he represented merely the monolatric concept, and his identification with the Babylonian *Ea* thus offers no difficulty from the theogonic point of view. Assyriologists will remember that during the early Semitic rule, that is, under the South Arabian dynasty founded at Ur by Sumu-Abi, *Ea* was only a secondary deity, being subordinate, as king of the waters, to Anu and Bel-Merodach, rulers aloft. But it was not always so, and originally, that is, in pre-Semitic Sumerian times, *Ea* must have been the chief god, since he was the father of Merodach himself, that is, the Amar-uduk, "Brightness of the Day," who acquired the place of eminence by his triumph over the Mummū-Tiāmat of the Babylonian Dragon-myth. In this contest *Ea* behaves badly ; he trembles with fear and, in prosaic language, runs away. But later he retrieves his honours in the Deluge-myth in which he plays the leading part, though now under the watchful eye of Merodach. He foretells the coming catastrophe to Xisuthros (Hasisadra), the Chaldaean Noah, instructs him how to build the ship, prescribes its dimensions, and so on. Now this Babylonian version of the myth is referred to the time of Khammu-rabi (Amraphel), one of Sumu-Abi's successors at Ur, where he ruled as vassal of the Elamite king Laghghamar, who has been identified by Pinches with the Chedorlaomer routed by Abram (Gen. xiv).

This identification has been questioned<sup>1</sup> ; but in any

allem . . . blieb POLYTHEISMUS, krasser Polytheismus, drei Jahrtausende hindurch die babylonische Staatsreligion" (*Babel und Bibel*, 1902, p. 49).

<sup>1</sup> In his excellent *Early History of Syria and Palestine* ("The Semitic Series," 1902), Dr. L. P. Paton accepts the record as genuine, and even bases on it an argument for the authenticity of some of the earlier parts of the Hexateuch, remarking that "the theory that a Jew of the exile derived the history of Gen. xiv from [late] Babylonian sources is fraught with grave difficulties." He, however, infers that the Abram of the incident was unconnected with the Abraham, father of Isaac, &c., whom

case Sayce is justified in asserting that "the monarchs who ruled at Babylon when Abram was born [not later than 2000 B.C.], claimed the same ancestor as did Abram's family, and worshipped him as a god. The [Semitic] kings who succeeded to the inheritance of the old [pre-Semitic Sumerian] Babylonian monarchs of Ur were thus allied in language and race to the Hebrew patriarch. Nor is this all. We find in the contracts which were drawn up in the reigns of the kings of Ur and the successors of Sumu-Abi, not only names like Sabâ, 'the Sabaeen,' but names also which are specifically Canaanitish or Hebrew in form. Thus Mr. Pinches has discovered in them Ya'qub-il and Yasup-il [Jacob and Joseph], and elsewhere we meet with Abdiel and Lama-il, the Lemuel of the Old Testament. Even the name of Abram (Abi-ramu) himself occurs among the witnesses to a deed which is dated in the reign of Khammu-rabi's grandfather, and its Canaanitish character is put beyond question by the fact that he is called the father of 'the Amorite<sup>1</sup>.'"

We also know from the Tel el-Amarna tablets that in the age of Abram and long before it most of Western Asia was dominated by the Babylonian arms and culture. Over 2,000 years prior to the exodus Sargon I had reached the Mediterranean, and Hommel tells us that Sinai is so called from the Moon-god Sin, who forms an element in the name of Sargon's son and successor, Naram-Sin, "Beloved of Sin." Hence "in migrating from Babylonia to Canaan, Abram was merely passing from one part of the Babylonian empire to another. The same manners and customs, the same law, even *the same theology and literature* prevailed in both. The Babylonian divinities, Anu and Dagon, Hadad and Nebo, Istar or Astoreth, were worshipped in Canaan; and at Haran, where the patriarch

he does not regard as an historical person, but as "the collective name of a group of Aramaean peoples, &c." This, like his explanation of Yahveh, as the "God of Sinai and of Midian," seems to me paradoxical, and opposed to all intrinsic and external evidence.

<sup>1</sup> *Early History of the Hebrews*, p. 62.

rested on his road to the west, was a temple of the Moon-god, second only to that of Ur, and founded like it by Babylonian hands<sup>1</sup>. Lakhmu, one of the primæval Babylonian gods, was enthroned at Bethlehem; Anat, consort of Anu, occurs in the name Shamgar ben-Anath of the Song of Deborah, and *Ur* itself, meaning "city," is said to be the first element in *Jerusalem*, that is *Uru-Salem*, "city of Salim," god of peace<sup>2</sup>. This was the god Ninip who was still worshipped by the Jebusites on Zion in pre-Davidic times, long after Jerusalem had ceased to be a Babylonian stronghold.

It was therefore inevitable that Ea also should be found amongst the אֱלֹהִים, which accompanied Abram when he moved from Ur westwards, and may have even been the very penates which were afterwards stolen by Rachel from his kinsman, Laban, who had remained behind at Haran (Padan-Aram) when the patriarch continued his journey to Canaan. They were in fact those "other gods" which were "served" by Terah and his sons Abram and Nachor when they "dwelt on the other side of the flood [Euphrates] in the old time": וַיַּעֲבֹדוּ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים (Josh. xxiv. 2)<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Sayce, *Genesis* (Temple ed.), p. x. See also Delitzsch, *Babel u. Bibel*, p. 28.

<sup>2</sup> So at least Sayce and Hommel, interpreting some Tel el-Amarna documents. But Cheyne, a safer and far keener critic, though not an "Assyriologist," thinks that "we cannot at present grant that Salimmu [Salim] is the name of a god, much less that his priest [Melchizedek] was the king of Jerusalem" (*Founders of O. T. Criticism*, p. 239). The LXX also makes ט = χώρα, *terra*, *regio*, not *urbs*; with which cf. Jer. xxiv. 5: אֲרָץ כַּדְרִי = *terra Chaldaeorum*.

<sup>3</sup> This passage is fatal to the vehement special pleading of Hommel on behalf of the "highest and purest monotheism" which he ascribes to the patriarchs, and to all the proto-Semites generally (*Anc. Hebrew Tradition*, pp. 76, 80, 88, 292, &c.). Here the Vulg. and A.V. have "servierunt" and "served" somewhat euphemistically; but LXX the uncompromising καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν θεοὺς ἑτέροις. No doubt there are interpolations in Joshua, such as chap. xv shown by a comparison with LXX to be from Neh. xi. But it is unthinkable that a later scribe or monotheistic editor would wantonly put words into Joshua's mouth, needlessly stigmatizing the father of his people and of his religion as idolatrous at first.

But although only one amongst many, Ea must still have been held in high esteem, not only as a member of the oldest Babylonian triad—Anu, Bel, Ea—but also because of the conspicuous part he had played in the Story of the Flood, a document which was necessarily known to Abram, and was no doubt brought by him with other reminiscences from “Ur of the Chaldees.” Here I should like to point out that the historic character of Abram, so strenuously denied by Wellhausen, Cheyne, and most of the “higher critics,” seems clearly established by this very expression “from Ur of the Chaldees.” In the Hebrew it is *Kasdîm* (מַאֲדִי כַּשְׁדִּים) which was the form current in the time of Abram’s contemporary, King Khammu-rabi. Later it became successively *Kardu* and (during the captivity) *Kaldu*, whence the LXX ἐκ τῆς χώρας τῶν Χαλδαίων, and the Vulgate *de Ur Chaldaeorum*. If therefore the “Abramic Myth” were an exilic creation, or a מִדְּרָשׁ, the eponymous hero must have been described as migrating from *Ur-Kaldîm*, and not from *Ur-Kasdîm*, a form already obsolete as a geographical expression in post-exilic times. Hence although *Kasdim* still persists in Isaiah (chaps. xiii, xliii, xlvii, xlviii), in Ezekiel (i, xi), and in Jeremiah (chaps. xxiv, xl, xli), Daniel substitutes שִׁנְעָר (*Shinar*, i e. *Shumir* or *Sumir*, the original name of the pre-Semitic South Mesopotamia) for the land (chap. i. 2). Daniel’s כְּשָׁדִיִּים (v. 7, and elsewhere) does not mean “Chaldaeans” in the ethnical sense, but I think always “wise men” or soothsayers. Sayce, however, suggests that *Kasdim* “most probably represents the Assyrian *Casidi*; ‘conquerors,’” in reference to the Semitic conquerors of Sumir and Akkad, while “the Greek word *Chaldaeans* is derived from the *Kaldâ*, a tribe which lived on the shores of the Persian Gulf, and is first heard of in the ninth century before our era. Under Merodach-Baladan the *Kaldâ* made themselves masters of Babylon, and became so intimate a part of the population as to give their name to the whole of it in classical times” (*Fresh Light from the*

*Ancient Monuments*, p. 50). It is curious to find Herodotus using this term both in the sense of a people (τούτων δὲ μεταξὺ Χαλδαῖοι, vii. 63) and of the priests or ministers of the god Bel (ὡς λέγουσι οἱ Χαλδαῖοι ἐόντεςί ρέες τούτου τοῦ θεοῦ, i. 181, and elsewhere). The explanation of this puzzle is that the Chaldaeans long after losing their political power retained their renown as the depositaries of ancient Babylonian lore. Ceasing to be a tribe or a nation, they became the astrologists, wizards, and soothsayers of the eastern world.

Returning to Ea, it is reasonable to suppose, on the specified grounds, that he would be generally well received as a superior deity, eclipsing Merodach himself, and gradually taking a foremost place amongst the local gods, until he became at last the national god of Israel. Merodach, it should be remembered, had the great disadvantage of being intimately associated with Bel, and as the Baalim of evil repute were already numerous enough amongst the Amorites, Philistines, and Canaanites, a reformer like Moses might on this account also have been induced to give the preference to Ea (Yah), introducing him, perhaps somewhat suddenly, at the psychological moment some time during the exodus, and thus would be explained the rather startling announcement in Ex. vi. 3.

This is the more probable since on three tablets in the British Museum, dating from the time of Khammu-rabi and his father Sin-mubaliṭ, Delitzsch has recently found *Ea* already identified with *ilu* (*el*), the most general name for the deity amongst all the early Semitic peoples. Subjoined is one of the passages, with this eminent Semitic scholar's transliteration <sup>1</sup>:—

𒂗𒂗𒂗 𒂗𒂗𒂗 𒂗𒂗𒂗 𒂗𒂗𒂗

*Ia- ah- ve- ilu*

𒂗𒂗𒂗 𒂗𒂗𒂗 𒂗𒂗𒂗 𒂗𒂗𒂗

*Ia- hu- um- ilu*

<sup>1</sup> *Babel und Bibel*, p. 47. There is an error in the Cuneiform text as here



It would be impossible to overrate the value of these texts in the present connexion. They at once establish the original form of *Yahveh* (*Ia* or *Ea*) which has been arrived at independently by different processes of reasoning by Glaser and Levy. And they also show that so early as the time of Abram, if not earlier, this Akkado-Sumerian divinity had already been recognized by the first Semitic conquerors of Babylonia as equal in rank or identical with the great god *Ilu* himself. Hence his adoption by Moses during the exodus was after all but a natural revival, and had merely the effect of perpetuating the relations between *Elohim* and *Jahveh*, as already accepted in a general way by the Semitic forefathers of the Israelites while they still sojourned in Padan-Aram. Well may Delitzsch exclaim that these fragmentary Cuneiform tablets are priceless documents recording names “welche religions-geschichtlich von weittragendstem Interesse sind — die Namen: *Jahve ist Gott* . . . dieser *Jahve* ein uraltes Erbteil jener kanaänäischen Stämme, aus welchen dann nach Jahrhunderten die zwölf Stämme Israels hervorgehen sollten” (ibid.). The very expression—“*Yah is El*”—strikes a Biblical note, and might have served as the archetype for the numerous analogous formulas which pervade Holy Writ from the Pentateuch to the Prophets.

In any case all these deities—I am sceptical about De Lagarde’s *El*=“Goal”—had probably at first been merely the *δαίμονες ἐπιχώριοι*, the *genii loci*, that is, the tribal, district, or territorial gods, who were the potent champions of the national cause, and shared the fate of their votaries. How completely bound up they were with the political vicissitudes of the times, down even to the very close of the pre-exilic period, is well seen in Is. xxxvi and xxxvii, where Sennacherib’s herald, Rabshakeh (“Head Sheikh”), scornfully asks the men seated on the wall, “*Ubi est Deus Emath et Arphad? Ubi est Deus Sepharvaim?*” But

reproduced; but this is corrected in the above transcript from an *erratum* supplied by Delitzsch on a separate slip.

farther on these territorial *gods* have become the *kings* of these places: "Ubi est rex Emath, et rex Arphad?" &c. As who should say, we have vanquished the gods with the kings of Sepharvaim and of Samaria, and so will it be with Hezekiah also and his god, Yahveh! This belief in the potency of the *genius loci* still survives even amongst Christian peoples, and Prince Kropotkin tells us that the Siberian Cossacks hold the district gods of the heathen "in a sort of awe. They don't think much of them, but these gods, they say, are wicked creatures bent on mischief, and it is never good to be on bad terms with them<sup>1</sup>."

#### V. YAHVEH.

Even Yahveh, despite his high Babylonian pedigree, formed no exception to the general law of upward development, but, like all the other θεοὶ ἐπιχόριοι, passed successively from the polytheistic through the monolatrie to the monotheistic phase, this last not being reached till some time before the captivity. The process itself is in accordance with the inflexible laws of nature, which does nothing in a hurry, since "slowly and as by instinct mankind struggles towards the light" (Matthew Arnold).

Yahveh's transition from *Ea* (read also *Aē* and *Ia* in the Cuneiform documents) presents no phonetic difficulty, such as that of Glaser's break-neck jump from *Dyaus* to *Ea* and *Yah*. There are no troublesome initial dentals or sibilants (*d*, *ś*) to be explained away, and we know that the form *Yahu* (nom. case) was already familiar to the Assyrians, one of the lexical Cuneiform tablets giving this word as meaning a god in Hebrew, and identifying it with the Assyrian word *Yahu* = "myself." "Wherever," aptly remarks Sayce, "an Israelitish name is met with in the

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, I, p. 238. Cf. also the Thracian Zalmoxis at once both god and king (Herod. iv. 94, and Plato, *Charmides*, V); and "the gods who dwell in the land of Assur," quoted by Sayce from an Assyrian document (*Assyria*, p. 76).

Cuneiform inscriptions, which, like *Jehu* or *Hezekiah*, is compounded with the divine title, the latter appears as *Yahu*, *Jehu* being *Yahua*, and *Hezekiah* *Khazaki-Yahu*<sup>1</sup>."

This venerable Assyrian etymology seems almost to anticipate Mr. Levy's explanation of the Tetragrammaton יהוה, the self-subsisting, where, however, the Aramaic *hewâ* appears to be employed instead of the equivalent Hebrew יהי = "He is" (*v* or *w* for *y*). The substitution itself is highly suggestive, as implying that the Tetragrammaton in its present form can date only from the post-exilic period, when Ezra and the other priestly scribes were already much better acquainted with the northern (Syriac) than with the southern (Hebrew) language of the western Semites. No doubt the Aramaic יהוה (for the Hebrew יהיה) alone occurs in all the pre-exilic writings when used as a separate name. But it never occurs when this word forms one of the elements in compound names, where the *ו* is always final (paragogic or inflexional, not radical). The reason is because these—בניה, אבניה, and many others—are genuine national names, formed in Israel before the spread of Aramaic influences southwards, and left untouched, or at least rarely tampered with, by the post-exilic scribes of Aramaic speech. On the other hand, the exclusive use of יהוה merely lends additional support to the now generally accepted view that, as they now stand, all the pre-exilic texts are post-exilic recensions by Aramaic-speaking scribes.

It may be incidentally remarked that such popular and theogonic etymologies, as are here in question, were common enough in those early times, as shown, for instance, by the surprising transformations of the Babylonian god Dagon. This deity was originally associated with Anu, god of the sky, but was later supposed to be a fish-god, a sort of merman, because in Hebrew דג meant *fish*. But in Canaan-

<sup>1</sup> *Fresh Lights from the Ancient Monuments*, p. 75. Cf. also *Azri-Yahu* = *Azariah* = *Uzziah*, the Jewish king reduced by Tiglath-Pileser, c. 740 B. C.

itish 𐤀𐤍 meant *corn* ; therefore in passing still westwards he became a rural deity, guardian of the crops, brother of El and Baal, inventor of bread-corn and the plough.

Coming now to the theogonic evolution of Yahveh, it is important to note that a main result of the literary analysis of the "higher criticism" is that the Yahvistic document, formerly supposed to be the later portion of the Pentateuch, is now regarded as the earlier<sup>1</sup>, and is ascribed by some to a southern Jew, who flourished in the ninth century B.C., and held grossly anthropomorphic conceptions of Yahveh. The two Elohist portions, now almost inextricably interwoven with J, are attributed to some northern scribes, who wrote in the eighth century with a marked theological bias. Then there was a still later "Prophetic or Pre-Deuteronomic Redaction" by a writer or writers whose chief aim was to effect some sort of reconciliation between the contradictory J and E records. Deuteronomy and the other avowedly priestly documents are exilic or post-exilic, as indeed are all of the general and final recensions.

It follows that in its present form the great bulk of Biblical literature is post-Davidic, and consequently that much of the J and E phraseology occurring in the reputedly early texts is of but secondary importance for our purpose, and to be received with extreme caution whenever a "Tendenz" may be reasonably suspected. Some of the language employed by the post-exilic scribes may no doubt be the honest reflexion of unbroken esoteric tradition, oral or even written, for the Tel el-Amarna tablets alone are sufficient evidence of a widely-diffused knowledge of letters in pre-Mosaic and even in pre-Abramitic times. But there are passages bearing on the points here at issue which may be unhesitatingly rejected as the echoes, not of early traditions, but of contemporary theological teachings.

<sup>1</sup> Thus De Lagarde : "The abstract is everywhere later than the concrete ; therefore Elohim (as a singular) is later than Yahvé, &c." (quoted by Cheyne, *Founders of O. T. Criticism*, p. 184).

Such I hold to be Gen. xxi. 33, where the strange association of Yahveh with the *asherah* devoted to the orgiastic rites of Semitic heathendom<sup>1</sup> throws an unexpected light on the above-quoted passage from Josh. xxiv. 2; such Deut. x. 17, Exod. iii. 14, and especially the יהוה יחיד of Exod. vi. 3; and in general all those expressions which betray the transparent intention of endowing the Abramitic and Mosaic Jahveh with the attributes of pure monotheism. Such expressions are anachronisms, standing in violent contrast to the crude anthropomorphism which breaks out continually in the closest connexion both with Yahveh and Elohim throughout the whole of the pre-exilic period from Genesis to Ezekiel. Sayce, who is himself at times distinctly iconoclastic, rejects the theory of development in the Jewish religion, declaring it to be "a mere product of the imagination," and commits himself to the statement that the "belief in Yahveh displayed in the Song [of Deborah] is as uncompromising as that of later Judaism. Yahveh is the God of Israel who has fought for his people, *and beside him there is no other God*."<sup>2</sup> It is the here italicized words which do not occur in the text, that are the "product of the imagination." For Deborah Jahveh is merely a national deity, the "God

<sup>1</sup> In later times, when Israel was slowly emerging from the crude polytheistic state, all these *niẓẓim*, whether *effigies* (Judges iii. 7; 2 Kings xxiii. 6, &c.), or *groves*, of the goddess Astarte, as above, had to be destroyed. Hence the injunction, *lucos igne comburite*, in Deut. xii. 3, and elsewhere.

<sup>2</sup> *Early History*, pp. 301-2. It may be pointed out that the development theory so rashly denied by Sayce is fully admitted by the late Dean Farrar, who refers to the teraphim, the golden calf, the betylia, the brazen serpent, &c., as proving "most decisively that a pure monotheism was the result of a slow and painful course of God's disciplinary dealings amongst the noblest thinkers of a single nation, and not, as is so constantly and erroneously urged, the instinct of the whole Semitic race; in other words, one single branch of the Semites was under God's providence *educated* into pure monotheism only by centuries of misfortune and series of inspired men" (Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*, III, p. 986).

of Israel," who needs aid and curseth the people of Meroz "because they came not to the help of Yahveh," for whom also "from Heaven fought the stars; in their courses they fought against Sisera." This is rank astrology, and Sayce himself admits that the Judges belonged to an age when "the Baalim seemed to have gained the mastery over Yahveh" (*ibid.*, p. 288). And commenting on the altar raised by Gideon to *Yahveh-Shalom* on the ruins of that of his rival Baal, he also admits that "it is true that between Yahveh and Baal the Israelite of the day saw but little difference<sup>1</sup>. Yahveh was addressed as Baal, or 'Lord,' and the local altars that were dedicated to him in most instances did but take the place of the older altars of a Canaanitish Baal. Mixture between Israelites and Canaanites, moreover, had brought with it a mixture in religion. Along with the titles, Yahveh had assumed the attributes of a Baal, at all events among the mass of the people" (p. 308).

What "a mixture in religion" may mean is not quite clear. But when we are told that the cult of the zealous Yahveh was thus contaminated by the cult of Baal, god of the conquered Canaanites, we are reminded of the *Graecia capta* which *feros victores cepit*. But Sayce goes further, and after wrestling with the exceedingly anthropomorphic episode of Jacob and the ladder, calls Yahveh "the God of the locality" (p. 81), just as Cato (quoted by Dionys. Hal. ii. 49) calls Sabus, the eponymous hero of the Sabines, ὁ Σάγκου δαίμονος ἐπιχωρίου, "son of the local god Sancus"! Moreover, in Judges xvii, Yahveh becomes an idol, a molten image of silver, worshipped jointly with the teraphim in the house of Micah; on which Sayce again writes: "The

<sup>1</sup> W. R. Smith's reference to another such incident in the history of Gideon is instructive: "Gideon erects a sanctuary at Ophrah, with a golden ephod—apparently a kind of image—which became a great centre of illegal [idolatrous] worship" (*op. cit.*, Lect. VIII, p. 220). Still later the very Temple itself was invaded by the worshippers of the Babylonian Tammuz, identified with the Phoenician Adon and the Greek Adonis (*Ezek. viii. 14*).

ordinary Israelite, including a Levite who was the grandson of Moses, takes it for granted that Yahveh must (sic) be adored in the shape of a twofold idol. Nay more; by the side of the graven and molten images, which were meant to represent the god of Israel, we find also the images of the household gods or teraphim, whose cult forms part of that which was paid to the national deity" (ibid., p. 281). Here "the national deity" again becomes, like Ea, one of the numerous gods whom Abram brought with him from Ur to Haran. And this cult, which he shared with the other teraphim, "survived to the latest days of the northern kingdom; it was practised in the household of David (1 Sam. xix. 13) and is even regarded by a prophet of Samaria as an integral portion of the established religion of the State (Hos. iii. 4)" (ibid., p. 281).

We read further that, in the time of the Judges, "though officially the Baal of Israel was Yahveh, the mass of the people worshipped *the local Baal of the place in which they lived*<sup>1</sup>. Yahveh was scarcely remembered even in name (sic); his place was taken by the Baalim and Astaroth of Canaan" (ibid., p. 333). Now a protest must be raised against this distinction between "the Baal of Israel" and the other Baals. It was not recognized by the later redactors, for whom the very word Baal was such an abomination that it was eliminated, for instance, from the *Yobal* of Judges ix. 26, the Massoretic text substituting בן-עבד, "son of a slave," for the true form preserved in the LXX. So also *Adoni-jah* and *Jeho-shaphat* take the place of *Adoni-baal*, and *Baal-shaphat*, although elsewhere we have בַּעַלְיָה, where Baal is actually declared to be Yah, as

<sup>1</sup> All did so, and W. R. Smith points out that even "to Isaiah Jehovah's presence with his people is still a *local thing*. It could not, indeed, be otherwise, for the people of Jehovah was itself a conception geographically defined, bound up with the land of Canaan, and having its centre in Jerusalem" (op. cit., p. 355). And at p. 379: "It was as natural for an Israelite to worship Jehovah as for a Moabite to worship Chemosh." In other words, the tribal territory and its tutelary deity were co-extensive geographical expressions.

if in the protracted struggle between the two rivals the the national god of Canaan had at one time overcome the national god of Israel. In any case even David looked on the sway of Jahveh, not as absolute but as geographical, strictly limited to Israel, since when driven into exile he said to Saul that "it was not only from his country that he was driven, but from the God of his country as well. In leaving Judah for Gath he had transferred his duties from Israel to Philistia, from Saul to Achish [king of Gath], from Yahveh to Dagon<sup>1</sup>." Hence, whenever the Israelites were overcome in battle, Yahveh was also considered to be overcome, and in the inscription on the Moabite Stone King Mesha is able to boast that, after vanquishing Astaroth and Nebo [the Babylonian god of prophecy worshipped on Mount Pisgah], he took from them the arels [champions?] of Dodah and Jahveh, and rended them before Khemosh<sup>2</sup>.

As this Moabite chief is identified with the Mesha of 2 Kings iii, we are still only at the monolatric stage in post-Solomonic times, for he was the contemporary of Jehoram of Israel and Jehoshaphat of Judah. One is at times inclined to ask whether the pure monotheistic concept has ever been fully realized except by a narrow esoteric circle, whether even in these latter days Yahveh is not still for many the God of the "Congregation of Jacob" rather than the *Ens Supremum* in the strict sense of the term. Thus the truly lovable and large-minded Moses Mendelssohn (grandfather of the composer) writes in his famous reply to Lavater: "Our rabbis unanimously teach that the Law is obligatory on our people alone." All others are to conform to the laws of nature and of reason, and those that do so "are called virtuous and the children of eternal salvation<sup>3</sup>." This is quite in the spirit of Ruth's

<sup>1</sup> Sayce, *Early History*, p. 390.

<sup>2</sup> Sayce, *The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*, p. 367. Khemosh was the chief god of Moab.

<sup>3</sup> M. Samuels, *Memoirs of M. Mendelssohn*, p. 54.



“Thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God”—a beautiful lesson of universal love and forbearance, if not under an all-pervading Jahveh, then, perhaps, in Spinoza’s all-diffused *natura naturans*.

An affirmative reply may now be given to the question at the opening of this essay.

DYAU, a vague personification of the sky, has no kind of relation to Yahveh, but is connected through their common Aryan origin with ZETΣ and JUPITER, more concrete personifications of the sky. These two are equally unconnected with

JAHVEH, who is to be identified in every way with the Babylonian primaeval god EA.

These relations are indicated by the bracketing of the two separate groups at the head of this article.

A. H. KEANE.